DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 627 08 CE 011 960

AUTHOR McGowan, Eleanor Farrar; DeSanctis, John E.
TITLE Experience-Based Career Education: A Study of First Year Implementation.
INSTITUTION Huron Inst., Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 76
CONTRACT NIE-400-76-0099
NOTE 60p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Career Education; Educational Development; Educational Finance; Educational Research; *Pilot Projects; Program Attitudes; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Regional Laboratories; *School Community Programs; School Organization; Secondary Education; Student Attitudes; Student Reaction; Teacher Attitudes; *Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS Experience Based Career Education

ABSTRACT

The first part of a larger study of Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE), this report deals with the implementation of EBCE during its first operational year and identifies six major themes which emerged from visits to the four laboratories which developed EBCE and to 10 EBCE pilot sites. The themes, each presented in a different chapter, involve (1) reactions of EBCE program staff to the innovation; (2) reactions of students; (3) EBCE impact on school organization and structure; (4) EBCE impact on a shift in the locus of learning from school to the community; (5) impact of shrinking school budgets on EBCE; (6) and different ways the laboratory staffs and local project staffs view the implementation of EBCE. A final chapter of the report presents brief sketches of the 10 EBCE pilot sites visited. (LMS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

JUL 14 1977

ED141627

Experience-Based Career Education:

A Study of First Year Implementation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Eleanor Farrar McGowan
John E. DeSanctis

The Huron Institute
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

November 1976

Final report prepared for The National Institute of Education, pursuant to contract NIE-400-76-0099. The views contained herein are those of the authors and do not represent those of N.I.E. or The Huron Institute.
This report is not to be published or excerpted without the written consent of the authors.

CE 011 960

PREFACE

This report of The Huron Institute is based on a study of Experience-Based Career Education's first year of implementation. It was commissioned by the Education and Work Task Force of The National Institute of Education as the first part of a larger study. For the next three years, through 1979, The Huron Institute will continue to study EBCE dissemination and implementation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study is concerned with the implementation of Experience-Based Career Education during its first operational year. From mid-June to mid-August, staff of The Huron Institute visited 10 EBCE pilot sites, as well as the four labs which developed EBCE, in order to determine their views on implementation and learn how they perceive EBCE implementation efforts to date.

Six themes emerged from the summer work, and these are the subject of this report. One theme concerned the reactions of EBCE program staff to the innovation, and another theme concerned the reactions of students. The study revealed a mixed picture in both instances in that Huron found that with respect to staff, their reactions seem to reflect the strategies used to recruit them and their personal compatibility with the goals and values inherent in EBCE. Students are reported to be enthusiastic about the substance of the innovation, but have concerns about its impact on their social and extra-curricular lives. A third theme concerns the impact of EBCE on the organization and structure of schools. Here Huron found evidence of some school system resistence to the innovation, with consequent implications for EBCE implementation. A fourth theme concerns EBCE's impact on the ecology of schools and its efforts to shift the locus of learning from school to the community. There is some uncertainty about how much shift has occurred, but evidence during this early phase of implementation suggests that most deliberate learning still takes place in school. A fifth theme concerns

the impact of shrinking school budgets, and in this regard, EBCE programs, like most everything else in schools, are often pinched. There are, however, mixed reports on whether this has caused harm. A final theme concerns the different ways the labs and local project staff view the implementation process. Huron found that people in different roles had different ideas of what implementation is and how it should proceed. This section concludes with a discussion of these differences and how they influence perceptions of progress to date. A final chapter of this report presents brief sketches of the ten pilot sites Huron staff visited.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Preface	i
	Executive Summary	ii
	Table of Contents	iv
I.	Introduction	1
II.	EBCE Staff Responses	6
III.	Student Responses to EBCE	6
IV.	EBCE's Impact on School Organization and Structure	15
V.	EBCE Impact on the Locus of Student Learning	20
VI.	The Impact of Shrinking Budgets	21
VII.	Lab and Site Views on Implementation:	
	The Labs	27
	The Sites	39
VIII.	Sketches of Ten EBCE Sites	47

I. Introduction

During the course of the past several months, The Huron Institute has been engaged in a study of the implementation of Experience-Based Career Education. The study was commissioned by NIE's Education and Work Task Force in order to learn about the process and progress of implementation during the program's first operational year. The hope was that this study would not only shed light on the question of what is happening to EBCE in the field, but would also illuminate important issues, trends and themes that a more extensive and prolonged study of EBCE implementation might explore.

In the view of Huron staff, implementation was expected to be perceived differently by the four labs which developed the innovation and the pilot sites now in operation. We expected these different perceptions to reflect their different roles with respect to the innovation -- to wit, one group has invested considerable time and energy in developing the assumptions and ideas underlying EBCE and career education more generally into a formal, substantive program, while the other group has adopted the innovation to meet a varied set of local needs. We expected that the developers would view implementation in reference to the models they have developed, while the adopters would view implementation in terms of its success in meeting whatever local needs were considered important.

It seemed to Huron that one thing to attend to in this study of EBCE's first operational year was these different views of implementation. We hoped to clarify them in order to understand the particular filters or perspectives through which information about the implementation process

passed. We thus began our work by meeting with EBCE staff at each of the four labs which developed the innovation. The purpose was twofold: to learn more about their models and how they feel the models should be implemented for fidelity, and to learn about their perceptions of what has occurred in the pilot sites as a way of shedding light on the developers' views of implementation in general. Of course, we were also interested in the adopting sites, and viewed the lab visits as an opportunity to learn more about them.

During these lab visits, we learned about their views on implementation, and how the process might best proceed for a reasonably faithful replication of their models. These are discussed later in this report. We also learned a fair amount about the sites we later visited -- such things as the numbers of students and staff involved, geographic, demographic and socio-economic characteristis of the sites, lab perceptions of the reasons for local adoption, lab training and technical assistance provided to local adopters, and, of course, how well, in the labs' views, implementation is proceeding.*

Our work then took us to ten pilot sites. From late June through mid-August, we visited Far West Lab sites in Fresno and Salt Lake City; Sewell, New Jersey and Washington, Pennsylvania, both Research for Better Schools' sites; Northwest Regional Lab's sites in Hillsboro, Oregon, and Colville and Kennewick, Washington; and Appalachian Education Laboratory sites in Kanawha County, Staten Island, and North Syracuse, New York. On these visits, we observed some programs that were operating, gathered project documents, and learned about the communities and why they decided

*This information was recorded in Huron's field notes on lab visits. NIE has a complete set of these notes as well as notes on the site visits.

to implement EBCE. But most important, we interviewed at length nearly thirty key actors in local EBCE programs, over and above the twenty lab people we talked with.

The data we collected, then, and our analyses of it, are the result of less than three months' work and included visits to 10 of the 25 operating EBCE pilot sites at that time. Our site sample was not selected in any scientific manner; rather, for the most part, we visited sites which the labs suggested would produce the most information about implementation. And, of course, we visited sites with EBCE staff available for us to meet. This may have been the best way to learn a fair amount, given that the study was conducted after the regular school year had ended, but there were limits to what we could learn and a bias to the data we obtained. We could not interview all project participants in each site, nor could we visit project participants with parallel roles in each site. Problems with scheduling site visits due to the short start-up time of the study were compounded by the vacation schedules of local site personnel. Thus, we did not hear from a cross-section of project people at any one site -- we talked with only one student all summer -- nor did we interview the same kinds of people across sites -- in a few places, we were unable to meet with the project director. Our data, then, is necessarily partial and fragmented. If it has a bias, it's toward the school administrator's point of view, since they were the people we saw most regularly: of twenty-eight site staff interviewed, 14 were administrators. We interviewed at least one administrator in nine of the ten sites we visited. The remaining site staff we talked with were project directors without line responsibilities in the system, learning coordinators, learning site analysts or work-exper-

ience coordinators, and student counsellors and guidance staff. We also met with one employer advisory board director, who was a representative of the employer groups serving EBCE students.

Our interviews, then, while not comprehensive at each site, did include people representing a full cross-section of all roles central to EBCE. We thus learned how people serving in different roles feel about implementation from the perspective of their roles. But it is difficult to generalize on the basis of these conversations how people in the same role at other sites view what has happened so far.

Several themes emerged from the summer work, and this report will discuss these in some detail. One theme concerned the reactions of EBCE program staff to the innovation, and another theme concerned the reactions of students. Our study revealed a mixed picture in both instances in that we found that with respect to staff, their reactions seem to reflect the care with which they were recruited and their personal compatibility with the goals and values inherent in EBCE. Students are reported to be enthusiastic about the substance of the innovation, but have concerns about its impact on their social and extra-curricular lives. A third theme concerns the impact of EBCE on the organization and structure of schools. Here we found evidence of some school system resistance to the innovation, with consequent implications for EBCE implementation. A fourth theme concerns EBCE's impact on the ecology of schools and its efforts to shift the locus of learning from school to the community. There is some uncertainty about how much this has occurred, but evidence during this early phase of implementation suggests that most deliberate learning still takes place in school. A fifth theme concerns the impact of shrinking school budgets on

EBCE programs, and our study revealed that EBCE, like most everything else in schools, has felt the pinch. However, there are mixed reports on whether this has caused any damage. A final theme concerns the different ways the labs and local project staff view the implementation process. We found that people in different roles hold different ideas of what implementation is; a section below contains a discussion of these differences and how they influence different people's notions of progress to date. A final chapter of this report presents brief sketches of the ten pilot sites we visited. These are intended to provide an overview of the sites and present something of the style and flavor with which EBCE is being implemented in different regions of the country, in urban and rural locales.

But though there are patterns or themes which have emerged from this brief summer study, we present these themes with some caution. First, as we mentioned earlier, we have an incomplete picture of implementation at each site because many key people were unavailable. Noticeably absent from the roster are students, parents, and employers in any number. And we did not interview school system personnel not involved in the programs, people who no doubt have views on EBCE and its impact on the school system and their work in particular. A study which included representatives of these groups would add a dimension which this one lacks, and might create a very different picture of implementation than the one we have at present.

A second reason for caution concerns the fact that our study was conducted at a very early stage of implementation at most sites we visited. Four sites began operating with students within a month or two of September 1975, and only two sites had been operating for as long as a year and a half. Four sites began operations in the winter of 1976, so roughly two-

fifths of our sample consisted of districts which were literally just getting their feet wet. Other studies of implementation provide ample evidence that innovations are generally quite rocky at the start, and EBCE is no exception, particularly in light of how much the innovation hopes to accomplish and how much it aspires to intervene in traditional ways of schooling. If anything, EBCE more than many other new programs, can be expected to take some time to be understood and accepted in school systems. Temporal considerations, then, have quite a lot to do with what we have discovered. We expect that return visits to these sites might reveal a very different picture than the one we have now.

Thus, we urge that the picture presented here be thought of more as a series of snapshots, rather than a full formal portrait of EBCE in the summer of '76. If anything, we hope readers will exercise caution in inferring anything from our findings; caution in considering the picture complete; and caution in predicting, based on this report, what will happen during the next three years at these sites, and others not yet studied. It is perhaps most accurate to think of this as an interim report of the early phase of EBCE implementation, rather than a final report of the first year of field operations.

II. EBCE Staff Responses

EBCE staff responses to the program have much to do with how the staff was recruited. Each of the four models describes and outlines appropriate strategies for identifying people most likely to be effective staff participants. These strategies generally suggest that recruitment be conducted system-wide, and that individuals with behaviors and attitudes most compatible with EBCE be invited to join the staff team. In sites where

recruitment was conducted in this manner, and where there was a selection pool of eager and compatible teachers, the people chosen to staff EBCE tended to have an easier time adjusting to the demands of the innovation. In these sites, administrators and project directors attributed much of the innovation's success to the quality of the staff selected.

These staff favor the innovation's goal of shifting more responsibility to students, and they seem more able to work with students as consultants and counsellors. They encouraged students to search out their own goals and purposes and proceed at a pace suitable for them. In our interviews with these teachers, or people speaking for them, it was clear that many find their work personally and professionally rewarding. For example, one learning coordinator spoke at length about his increasing disillusionment with traditional teaching as opportunities for individual student contact decreased. EBCE, however, gives him an opportunity to learn about the "hopes, dreams and ambitions" of students with whom he now works closely. He learns enough about students' fears to help them develop work experience programs which will gradually strengthen their self-confidence. Other teachers spoke with obvious delight at the professional flexibility which EBCE provides. Whether their EBCE programs were housed in separate sites or maintained as alternative programs within the regular school, they felt liberated from roles which constrained them, procedures they thought trivial, and behavior which the school culture seemed to press and reinforce. For many teachers who were carefully selected for their roles in EBCE, then, the innovation is viewed as a boon to their professional lives and their personal satisfaction. They would like to see the in-

novation grow and expand through the system, and seem to serve as something of an indigenous public relations cadre for the program.

Teachers who became EBCE staff either because they preferred that job to one they currently held, or because they were drawn from reserve teacher lists, have experienced more difficulty with the demands of the innovation. As we will discuss later, many teachers were selected in this manner because EBCE project directors did not have free reign to pick and choose staff through a process of open recruiting. This group of teachers seemed to support the innovation, but their personal characteristics and professional styles seemed often to conflict with the attitudes, values and behavior espoused by the innovation. The issue might seem to be one of insufficient lab training or technical assistance, for the difficulties this group experienced often led them to express a wish for more. In some cases, one might infer that more would help. But it seemed to Huron staff interviewing these teachers that the problems they experienced had more to do with the fact that they generally favored traditional teaching roles; while they weren't opposed to those which EBCE encouraged, they were more comfortable in traditionally-oriented positions. It isn't clear if training helps with such problems.

Regardless of how teachers were recruited, however, and regardless of levels of compatibility with EBCE values and behavior, all teachers experienced some difficulties assuming the new roles which the innovation requires. Some were aware of it and some were not, but all spoke either directly or indirectly of their tendency to redefine, adjust and adapt parts of the innovation to make them more like familiar

features of school. For example, group counselling activities, in which students are encouraged to talk about the difficulties that arise during the course of their work experiences, often were conducted more like homeroom settings than group counselling sessions. Teachers were reported to use these sessions to deal with "housekeeping" tasks, share administrative information, or tend to scheduling. Reportedly, teachers had difficulty meeting the goals of these group activities because they were unable or uncertain about how to lead student groups in discussions of this sort.

One result of this was that in many sites, teachers dispensed with group counselling activities altogether. They frequently said that they had so much to do that these sessions seemed a waste of precious time. Others said they abandoned the sessions because they didn't quite know how to use them, and others said they felt uncomfortable during them, though they were beginning to learn that such sessions were an important part of the program.

In any case, our work this summer revealed that parts of the innovation which require new student-teacher interactions were frequently either minimized, adapted to permit more traditional and familiar student-teacher interactions, or abandoned altogether.

If teachers had difficulty in assuming new roles vis à vis students, they also were frequently uncomfortable moving outside the school walls and making contact with employers. Many sites have been slow to develop employer site resources, and some teachers again attributed this to insufficient time. But at both labs and sites, we were told that often this is less a problem of time, and more a matter of teachers' uncertainty and lack of ease in moving out into the business community. Some

teachers feel that school is the proper locus of their work, while others feel incompetent to perform learning site analysis tasks or to competently manage discussions with employers abouf work experiences students might try.

Each of the four lab models suggest that contact with employer sites be the responsibility of one staff person suited to that role. But in several sites, either because of small-scale programs which spread many responsibilities among existing staff, or because of a local decision to launch a joint staff effort to develop sites quickly, teachers who were disinclined to make contact with employers were required to do so. Resistence in these cases was not explicit: teachers did not say they preferred not to do it. On the contrary, many said they were willing to meet with employers. But it does appear that once they got to it, either consciously or unconsciously teachers discovered they didn't like it, and consequently became less inclined to proceed. As a result, employer site development lagged, and in several sites, this seemed to be the chief implementation problem mentioned by site personnel.

With respect to EBCE staff, then, the theme which emerged from Huron's summer work is that professionals experience varying degrees of difficulty in assuming new roles required by the innovation, but that the difficulty is at least to some degree a function of the reasons why they are involved in EBCE, and the procedure by which they were selected. For many, the innovation provides an opportunity for personal and professional satisfaction beyond what traditional teaching affords. For others, satisfaction and compatibility with, or adjustment to, traditional teaching roles impede their ability to assume the new roles required by EBCE.

III. Student Responses to EBCE

As we noted earlier in this report, Huron's study was limited in that we were unable to interview students now participating in EBCE. As might be expected with an innovation of this sort, however, students have talked with EBCE staff about their views of the innovation, and these views were duly passed on to Huron staff during the course of our site visits. As also might be expected, student reactions vary. But they vary with respect to particular components and characteristics of the innovation, rather than the innovation as a whole.

By and large, local project staff presented a picture of considerable student satisfaction with the substance and intent of EBCE. In virtually every site we visited that had been operating for a year or more, we were told the story of some student who had been dramatically influenced by his or her experience in EBCE.* The stories concerned a range of students -- both boys and girls, college-bound and potential dropouts -- who found a new focus for their intellectual or career interests and experienced considerable personal growth as a result of the work experiences they had undertaken. It is reasonable to expect that there were others who didn't fare as well, but theirs were not stories that readily came to the minds of people with whom we spoke. The local staff's impression seemed to be that if EBCE did not have a favorable impact on some students, neither did it have a negative effect. We gathered that for some students, EBCE was no better and no worse than regular school. But in general, our summer interviewees said that most students are pleased with the innovation, and give it a favorable report.

* These stories are contained in Huron's field notes of site visits which have been sent to the Education and Work Task Force, so they won't be repeated here.

As we noted with respect to teachers, some students have experienced difficulty with different dimensions of the innovation. Perhaps most commonly cited was their difficulty in assuming the new roles and behaviors advanced by the innovation. Just as teachers have been troubled by the required shifts in their behavior and relationships with students, so too have students had difficulty dealing more openly with teachers. In some instances, they were reportedly puzzled by the requirement that they assume more responsibility for their learning. Some were skeptical that a school program could be so different, but many seemed not to know how to proceed. Sometimes teachers jumped in and assumed responsibility for them, leading them through goal-setting exercises and providing considerable direction. But in other cases, students thrashed around awhile before learning that indeed responsibility was theirs, and taking it. Student eagerness to assume responsibility, then, varied as much as did teachers' ability to relinquish it.

Student difficulties with EBCE paralleled those of the staff in other ways as well. We reported teachers' problems managing group counselling meetings, and it appears that students were uneasy with the format of these meetings as well. While this might be understood as some students noticing and reflecting teachers' discomfort, even teachers who reported few problems in managing these sessions reported that many students seemed awkward and ill-at-ease. Teachers attributed this to teen-agers' reluctance to speak openly before peers about personal experiences which might leave them open to judgment. Teachers

felt, then, that behavior called upon by this group setting -- the open discussion of problems, fears and difficulties related to work experiences -- required a new norm of student interaction, one which is widely thought to exist among youth, but which may exist more in popular myths about the youth culture than in the reality of their lives and relationships.

In our view, one of the most interesting and unanticipated questions students have about EBCE concerns the impact of their participation in it on non-academic roles, relationship and activities. Many students, while enthusiastic about the substantive content of the innovation, were reported to have reservations about the amount of time the program absents them from school. Suggested time spent in employer sites varies from model to model, ranging from a high of 80% of the school week to a low of one day per week. But at the middle of the range, as well as at the upper extreme, students complain about spending so much time away from friends. Some students have withdrawn from EBCE because they felt they were losing contact with close friends, while others were reluctant to join for fear of becoming marginal members of their friendship groups.

While its intervention in peer relationships is one reason students have reservations about EBCE, another is its interference in extra-curricular activities. In some sites, work experiences are scheduled for late in the day -- the time when most clubs and extra-curricular events convene. In other sites, students enrolled in EBCE relinquish their membership in regular high schools to become members of an alternative school program. In some of these cases, students were technically unable to return to their high school for non-academic activities; as a rule,

EBCE programs do not provide comparable extra-curricular schedules of their own. This has created a number of problems for EBCE student recruitment, for it tends to limit the available pool to students with no organized social interest in their schools. In particular, it has caused problems in recruiting boys, for enrolling in EBCE frequently meant giving up inter-scholastic athletic interests. Most of the sites we visited reported some student recruitment problems as a result of constraints the innovation places on social and extra-curricular participation. Some sites had successfully resolved the problem by negotiating with school administrators to enable EBCE students to participate in school activities. Other sites dealt with students' reservations by reducing the amount of time required at work sites. But at this stage of implementation, most sites are still searching for ways to respond to students' concerns about the impact of EBCE on their social relationships and activities. Site personnel expect some recruitment problems to continue until this issue is resolved.

With respect to how students feel about EBCE, then, our study reveals several themes, all of which will be closely explored during the next three years. One theme concerns students' reactions to the goals, purposes and aspirations of EBCE: students seem genuinely enthusiastic and receptive to these, and particularly eager to experience learning activities which inform them more about work. Another theme concerns their reactions to the format of the program: many students are cautious and uneasy about the amount of time EBCE removes them from the social arrangements school provides, and they are concerned about EBCE's impact on their social relationships and networks. Some EBCE formats preclude

student participation in extra-curricular clubs and athletics, and in the case of students for whom these things matter, EBCE does not seem an attractive alternative to regular school. Student reactions, then, are mixed.

IV. EBCE's Impact on School Organization and Structure

At this very early point in EBCE's history, it is particularly difficult to discern the impact EBCE has had on the social and administrative structure of schools, if any. One reason is because the study's duration and scope did not permit us to spend time examining in detail the practices and procedures specific to individual schools to provide a basis for comparison. But another reason is because these things are more elusive to school staff. They are more difficult for teachers to identify than the reactions of colleagues and students. Thus, when the question came up in our interviews, many people had difficulty responding. They seemed not to know, and not to have thought much about the question of EBCE's impact on the social and organizational structure of schools.

In our view, this wasn't surprising, since program impact of this sort generally happens slowly over time, and many small changes may have seemed inconsequential or were easily overlooked. But another reason may concern the length of time EBCE has been operating in the sites we visited. As mentioned earlier, only two sites had as much as a year and a half of experience with the innovation, and four sites had been operating for only six months. In our view, most of the districts probably had not had time to feel the impact of the innovation on prevailing administrative practice, and we suspect that later visits will reveal more.

The absence of information on what procedures had changed as a

result of EBCE, however, produced a bias in our study. When we raised questions about what had changed, people tended to talk about what hadn't changed, and what problems this created for the innovation. This produced considerable information on school system resistance to change, but not much on changes that had occurred. While we expect that EBCE has produced some changes in schools, we have not discovered any themes or patterns. We did, however, learn about institutional barriers to change, and there we did notice common threads.

Bureaucratic Barrier: Academic Credit

One barrier concerned the inability of some districts to award academic credit to students for work experiences out of school. Most programs had been unable to loosen the school district's adherence to the Carnegie Unit system; thus students received academic credits only for EBCE work conducted within the school proper, although this work may have been based on out of school experiences. This was problematic in that some students perceived their work experiences as a form of academic volunteerism which the school was unwilling to reward. For these students, the denial of direct credit for work experiences was a disincentive to enroll in EBCE. For others the problem was more immediate. Some systems required students to maintain a minimum number of Carnegie units depending on grade level in order to participate in athletic events, in particular. In these cases, some students spent alternate semesters in EBCE and the regular school program, earning fewer credits with EBCE, but making up the deficit the following term. While this may be an ingenious way of having EBCE and earning credits too, in effect it meant that these students did not have sustained contact with EBCE, its staff, and work sites. EBCE staff felt that as a result, students may have learned less all around. In one

site, for example, semesters change every eight weeks, and when students moved in and out of EBCE, the duration of their work experiences was reduced accordingly. EBCE program staff here thought this led to more superficial learning from work experiences, and they observed that students who moved out of EBCE after eight weeks did not have enough time to explore their work experiences in depth. The superintendent of this district recognized the problem and seemed eager to find a solution. But in the meantime, only students who have enough Carnegie units to be unconcerned about them are reportedly able to thoroughly explore the work experiences they choose.

Districts' inability to award credit for work experiences was reported to have an impact on student recruitment as well. Since most students seem most immediately attracted to EBCE because of its work component, some wondered why they should work for nothing -- neither money nor academic credit -- when after-school jobs are available which at least produce a paycheck. The individualized, affective, and personal growth-oriented dimensions of EBCE are sometimes difficult for students to grasp right away, we were told; unless they do, and these things are important to them, participation in EBCE seems to some like giving something for nothing.

Teacher and Administrator Resistance

Another school system obstacle to EBCE concerned the negative reactions of district teachers and administrators not involved in the innovation. In eight of the ten sites we visited, some mention was made of opposition, resentment, or lack of cooperation from other people in the system. Teachers were reported to resent the different -- and in their views, lighter -- job responsibilities of EBCE staff. They resent the lower student-teacher ratios which are common to EBCE; they resent what they perceive to be more

free time among EBCE staff; and they resent what they consider to be special treatment awarded to staff involved in the program.

Other teachers simply oppose the program, and we were told that this occurs for a number of reasons. Either they disagree with the pedagogical aims of EBCE, and believe that if anything, students need more formal work in the disciplines, not less. Or teachers are opposed to the notion of students spending what in some cases is a considerable amount of time out of school. These teachers reportedly feel that school is the most appropriate locus for learning, and that work experiences can hardly be called a learning enterprise. Other teachers resent and oppose the innovation because they feel it is a seductive but frivolous magnet drawing students away from the formal disciplines these professionals teach.

Some administrators share these concerns about EBCE, but we were also told that opposition to the program is frequent among school principals who fear that EBCE will draw good students away from their schools. In one district we were told that the hostility of school principals ran so deep that they refused to permit the project director into their schools to make a presentation to students about the innovation. Neither would they permit the posting of EBCE advertisements in their schools. The reason, according to EBCE staff who reported this, is that local schools and their principals are held in esteem according to the quality and talent of their students. Since there is never enough talent to go around, it seems, principals tried hard to avoid losing good students to anything, including EBCE.

Teacher and administrator opposition to the innovation is reported to have had an impact on some local EBCE programs and their students. Most commonly reported were the problems created by teachers unhappy about EBCE

students missing regularly scheduled classes to go to work sites. Apparently, some teachers have stirred up quite a storm with their principals about this, and others have gone so far as to refuse to allow EBCE students to make up work they missed as a result. One student, writing to her EBCE learning coordinator, discussed the harrassment she had received from a teacher. She concluded that though she thought EBCE was worth the trouble, she knew many students who would be threatened and discouraged by problems of that sort.

Another result of teacher and administrator opposition to EBCE reportedly has been a steady pressure on school officials to force up the EBCE student-teacher ratio to put it more in line with other programs. Another has been to use EBCE as a "dumping ground" for unruly or uninspired students. In this instance, the problem may be one of some people associating work-related programs with students who are potential drop-outs. But we were also told that teachers who understand that EBCE is designed to serve a range of students nonetheless try to use it as a program of last resort. In either case, problems result for EBCE staff who do not want to turn students away on one hand, but on the other are eager to maintain a cross-section of students in order to preserve the nature and intent of the innovation.

Another theme that emerged from the summer work, then, is that there is school system resistance to EBCE from some quarters. These will be closely studied during the next three years to see if time calms anxieties and fears, or whether these feelings persist. It seems clear from this vantage point that many teachers resent and oppose the innovation, whether

because of different philosophies about schooling or because they fear the innovation will ultimately have an impact on their professional lives and work. Administrator resistance to the innovation seem largely to spring from professional rivalries. Another main source of resistance, however, is in the administrative and legal constraints under which schools operate and in which EBCE hopes to intervene. The conditions under which academic credit may be awarded are one example of this. At this point in time, it's too early to speculate about what will give -- EBCE, the school systems, or both -- but this will be the object of considerable attention during the next few years.

V. EBCE Impact on the Locus of Student Learning

One important goal of EBCE is to intervene in the ecology of current schooling such that the locus of student learning shifts from the schoolhouse to the community. Evidence gathered during the summer study suggests that though some students spend considerable time on work experiences, the central location for deliberate teaching and learning interaction remains the school. This evidence is advanced with some caution, for we have not yet had the opportunity to speak with students, talk with employers and learn about precisely what sorts of interactions occur. However, local EBCE staff believe that most employers are not serving as teachers in some broad sense of the word, but rather serve as models at work whom students watch, and less frequently receive direction from.

We were told that there are exceptions. Student eagerness and initiative plays some part in what happens at work, as does the nature of the relationship which develops between an individual student and his employer resource person. Both clearly extend themselves more if the

liking is mutual. But by and large, we were told, employers, while eager to participate in EBCE, seem unwilling and feel unable to play a major pedagogical role. In addition, we were told that many students spend more time than they -- or their EBCE program staff -- prefer, watching rather than doing. Observation seems to be the chief vehicle for learning in work sites. Some EBCE staff blamed themselves for this turn of events: they felt they did not adequately prepare employer resource people for the teaching roles they were being asked to fill. Others thought the problem had more to do with employers: though they are eager to participate in EBCE, they don't want to take many risks, don't have the time it takes to teach the details of work, or they simply don't know how to teach and feel uncomfortable trying. Whatever the case, most EBCE program staff we interviewed said that while the nature of specific interactions between employers and students is a mystery, there seems to be less directed teaching taking place than they had hoped. As a rule, employers reportedly remain in control of what occurs during on-site work experiences, and while some put students on the front line, most cast them in the role of observer rather than active learner.

VI. The Impact of Shrinking Budgets

It comes as no surprise that shrinking budgets seem to take some toll on EBCE. Like everyone else in the school system, EBCE program staff feel they must do more with less. While financial constraints were reportedly the cause of some problems for EBCE programs in each of sites we visited, the weight of the problems vary depending on how important the program is to the district, and how much support it has

from those in command of the budget. In Salt Lake City, EBCE is well endowed, partly because it has strong administrative and community support and partly because EBCE has been a local beneficiary of state funds for career education. In other districts, however, where administrative support is in question because of top level staff changes; where community support is uncertain because voters are up in arms about school costs; or where school funds are so tight that it is remarkable that a new program was even launched, EBCE is reported to be marking an uneven course.

The repercussions of tighter budgets fall into several categories. One concerns the degree to which EBCE has been implemented thus far: tighter budgets were reported to have impaired the speed of implementation. Another concerns student-staff ratios, which in the views of staff in several sites have been sufficiently increased as to threaten EBCE's goals of individualization and increased student-teacher contact. Another concerns changes in staffing patterns and work loads for EBCE staff. In this case, some sites have reluctantly deviated from the design of the original models, and the problems which ensued were precisely those the developers had hoped to avoid. In most instances, local EBCE staff seem to have struggled hard to maintain the integrity of the innovation, and in most instances they feel they have been fairly successful. In most every site we visited, however, staff remarked that they carried responsibilities beyond those suggested by the developers. And they felt the program may have suffered as a result.

With respect to the implementation process, then, tighter budgets have meant that regardless of district preferences, EBCE has been slower to develop than expected. The chief impact of tight budgets, we were told, was insufficient planning time, and an inadequate number of local EBCE staff. In

some sites, project staff did not receive the full dose of lab training, and often they received less technical assistance than they would have liked. This was not reported to be the result of any problems or difficulties with the labs. Rather, local staff reported that there wasn't enough time to fully prepare before operations with students began, so if something in the schedule had to give, it often was training and employer site development. Both labs and site staff reported that in some instances, part of the training module was abandoned in the interest of time. And when new staff joined the project after initial training had been completed, districts sometimes left their orientation to trained staff. While some staff who had not been lab-trained felt adequately prepared by their colleagues, others expressed a wish for more formal preparation, and felt they could have performed better if they'd had it. A lack of adequate lead time, then, sometimes squeezed out important tasks during the early stages of planning and implementation.

While local staff spoke of these problems in terms of insufficient time, often they seemed to mean that the projects were understaffed. In several districts, staff reported that they were carrying more work than they felt they could adequately perform. They reported that administrative decisions to increase the student-teacher ratio, or to staff the project with fewer people than originally planned was the chief reason they felt overburdened, and they attributed these decisions to local financial difficulties. We observed during our visits that staff who felt most pressed for time seemed to be the same staff who most frequently abandoned less

familiar parts of the innovation, or who modified these components to make them more like familiar school practices. In the interest of time, then, staff sometimes did those things they already knew how to do.

One unfamiliar task which suffered was employer site development. Staff who felt overworked reported less progress in this area. They said that with much to do and many students to meet with individually, employer site development became a lower priority, chiefly because it took so much time. The need to develop work sites combined with inadequate time to do it produced some creative site development efforts. But by and large, staff reported that they were not using materials developed by the labs for this purpose, but instead were using locally developed short-cuts, some of which the labs viewed as not very helpful for orienting employers to the program and informing them of what EBCE was about. Local people observed that whether the problem was insufficient time or staff discomfort in dealing with employers, work site development was one of the most difficult, and thus one of the last, parts of the innovation to be fully and carefully implemented.

Another implementation problem which local staff attributed to financial difficulties concerned individual attention and teacher contact with students -- processes which the developers view as central to the success of EBCE. In many sites we visited, staff reported that student-teacher ratios were increasing, and individual student-teacher contact was decreasing as a result. Most of the lab models suggest a ratio of one learning coordinator to roughly 20 students. But in some districts, this ratio is pushing as high as 1:37, thus multiplying the demands made on teachers and reducing the time they spent with each student. We asked teachers what impact they expected increased ratios would have on the program, and while some said none, several reported that even under less

demanding ratios, they had had to cut individual student meetings from two hours to one hour per week. They feared increased ratios might cut this time even more.

Other staff reported that increased ratios would have the effect of focusing teachers' attention on students who sought it, or were unusual in some respect and attracted it. One learning coordinator reported that he was aware of spending unequal amounts of time with students, and that some of his students received little attention at all. But he didn't know what to do about the problem. He observed that students most in need of help were often the ones who got less, and that in this respect, student-teacher interactions developing within his EBCE program seemed similar to ones which developed in regular school: students who need the least help get most, and vice versa.

Some programs were successful in resisting administrative pressure to bring EBCE ratios more in line with regular programs. But these staff wondered how long they could hold out; they ventured that the outcome would depend on the strength of community support for the program, and the persistence of strong administrative support within the system. Another result of tightening budgets, then, is increased student-teacher ratios in EBCE programs, which reportedly undermines the innovation's goal of providing substantial individual attention for students.

A final theme with respect to the effects of financial constraints on EBCE programs concerns staffing patterns. Each of the four developers recommends a careful process of staff recruitment and selection, designed to insure that EBCE staff have values, attitudes and behavior consistent with the intent of the innovation. In only one of the ten districts we visited

were these recommendations rigorously followed, and it seemed to us that in many instances, significant deviations could be attributed to insufficient funds within districts. As we mentioned earlier, in some districts project directors were required to recruit staff from reserve teachers lists, and in others, district teachers requesting transfers had to be utilized as well. While this did not always produce a staff which varied much from what project directors hoped to find, several reported that there were one or two staff members whom they would not have selected had they been given a broader range from which to choose. Some felt, then, that these constraints diminished the total effectiveness of the project staff.

Other districts showed considerable ingenuity in staffing the programs in the face of limited budgets. In North Syracuse, for example, the decision to adopt EBCE was followed by a reassessment of district finances such that little seemed available for EBCE. Here the problem was resolved by hiring a retired teacher to serve as a part-time learning coordinator, and while the lab had reservations about how well this would work out, people in North Syracuse reported that the arrangement was quite successful. Students got on well with the individual, and the net cost to the district was small. Another district used a volunteer to recruit and develop employer sites, and this arrangement, too, reportedly worked out well.

Some districts staffed their programs with teachers who worked part-time in EBCE and part-time in regular classrooms, and our interviews with these people revealed that for some, the arrangement was most rewarding. They were able to both continue teaching courses to which they were committed, and experience the increased individual student contact which EBCE provides.

Some teachers felt dislocated splitting their time between two programs, and would choose EBCE full-time if they had the choice. But again, it seemed to us that individual teacher styles and preferences had much to do with how well arrangements of this sort worked out. In some instances, part-time or improvised staffing patterns were not reported to have a negative impact on the programs. But in other instances, restrictions placed on the choice of EBCE staff caused problems. It is clear, however, that districts have had to resort to staffing patterns which staff feel are less desirable than what the labs proposed. And it was reported that these changes are primarily the result of tight budgets in the districts and less money for EBCE.

VII. Lab and Site Views on Implementation

A final theme which emerged from our work this summer concerned the different conceptions of implementation which exist both within labs and sites and between them. We felt it was important to pay attention to the differences -- to understand and clarify them as well as to try to account for them -- because we believe that different perceptions of implementation serve as strong filters through which much information about implementation passes. The observation and analysis of these differences was an important first part of our study, then, because we felt it would help us decode information learned during site visits, and place it in a cohesive framework.

The Labs

The labs have essentially two views of implementation, and though these may appear to conflict, they seem to coexist within some individual staff members as well as lab staffs as a whole. These views concern implementation

as fidelity to the model and implementation as a process of adjusting and adapting the model to meet local needs. On one hand, the labs have spent considerable time developing models which they think best reflect the values and purposes of EBCE, and they have developed materials and processes for implementing it. They naturally think that they have developed what is needed to implement EBCE in the most successful and efficient way. On the other hand, the labs know that local needs and resources vary and that adaptation is bound to occur. They thus encourage adopters to make what they will of lab materials and strategies.

The balance between these two views is reflected in the models themselves -- to wit, some models are developed in considerable detail, thus requiring local districts to do little in the way of further development. Other models are predicated on the notion that local adopters must provide fine tuning themselves to best insure that the final product is responsive to local conditions.

Among the staff at each lab, different people seem to favor one or the other of these views. Some people seem to be minimally concerned with the model as a baseline for considering implementation. Rather, they think in terms of local adaptations of the model or in terms of mutual adaptation, with both model and site adjusting to the requirements of the other. These people think in terms of minimal conditions for successful implementation, and use as their frame of reference an "essential elements" checklist or the notion of "site gestalt" for determining when implementation is on the right track. In some cases, checklists have been formally developed, and in others the reference points are more loosely anchored. But in either case, there is the expecta-

tion that local sites will tinker with the model and, indeed, should.

Other lab staff seem to hold the other view of implementation -- that successful implementation is weighed against the formal model -- and though they talk about local adaptation, they speak of it with less enthusiasm. They know that adaptation is bound to occur, but they mostly think of it as less than desirable. In some instances, they seem to think of changes not as adaptations at all, but as deviations which are temporal functions of implementation, likely to be straightened out once local people have had more experience, or more compatible local conditions come about. This view, then, considers adaptation an anomaly. But both views together -- fidelity to the model and necessary and desirable adaptation -- are reflected in the different lab approaches to implementation and the varied strategies they have developed to assist local implementation.

Appalachia Educational Laboratory: This lab has developed its model with considerable attention to detail, which is consistent with its systems approach to implementation. AEL's model comes closest of the four to a self-contained package of the innovation, and there is comparatively little further development for local people to undertake. This is not to suggest that AEL thinks its model is easy to implement. On the contrary, the lab staff believe that technical assistance is what makes the difference between high and low fidelity efforts. AEL's view of implementation, then, stresses regular doses of technical assistance during the first year, and less as local staff become familiar with the model.

Of the four, this model most resembles familiar cooperative education programs; it calls for considerable student time spent in work settings -- up to 80%. For these reasons, there is less demand on teachers and local staff to learn dramatically different roles. This, combined with the detailed development of model materials and components, gives the model its broad appeal and makes it comparatively easy for districts to begin with modest local resources. The chief requirement is an ample supply of ready employer sites, and AEL has developed some standard employer site analyses to help local districts prepare for immediate student placement. These completed analyses for commonly utilized work experience settings -- such as hospitals -- are distinctly useful to small and overburdened local staff. Unlike other models which require local staff to develop their own employer site analyses, these prepared materials help ease the burden of start-up, particularly for sites with small staffs. Local districts are urged to develop their own site analyses eventually, but the lab has prepared materials for local use in the meantime.

AEL's version of EBCE, then, has wide appeal. It can be adopted by districts eager to implement the full model with locally prepared components, or it can be adopted by districts which choose to use prepared lab materials and implement gradually. This gives AEL a broad potential constituency, and the lab's marketing strategy reflects this. AEL has developed a sophisticated, two-pronged marketing approach, more commonly associated with business and industry than education. One prong is aimed at audiences with enough resources to undertake local materials development, while the other stresses the thoroughness with which

the model has been prepared and its readiness for use by districts unable to undertake extensive local development. AEL devotes considerable energy and attention to marketing EBCE and is perhaps in a better position to proceed in this manner because the model has been developed to appeal to districts with a broad range of local needs and circumstances.

Far West Educational Laboratory: Far West's approach to implementation reflects the view that local staff participation in refining the innovation is essential to make the venture work. Participation is central both to ensure that the model is tailored to local needs and as a way of building commitment and a sense of ownership among program staff. This view is reflected in the role described for students; they are expected to assess their needs, identify work preferences and set personal goals. Far West expects that its model will not be easily grafted on to the school system, but will require considerable redefinition of student and teacher roles in order to be well-implemented.

As a result, the Far West version of EBCE calls for substantial technical assistance beyond a lengthy and carefully formulated training and orientation program for local staff and students. The training module for staff consists of two weeks of training prior to start-up, and a week once operations with students are underway. The model also calls for a three-week orientation program for students to thoroughly familiarize them with EBCE's goals and to start them on their lengthy personal needs assessments. The result of all this is to make the Far West model most attractive to districts able to make a major commitment to EBCE and willing to undertake a venture which will introduce a genuine alternative program within the

larger system. Because the model has not been developed for easy or partial adoption -- although it has been partially adopted in some locales -- and because it requires major student and teacher role change, Far West expects to provide a substantial amount of technical assistance to local sites. This is apparent in the allocation of lab staff time, much of which is directed to providing on-going assistance to adopters.

Because the model requirements for local commitment are high, and probably also because the model was developed as an alternative school program, Far West's version seems to attract adopters searching for a viable alternative program for their students. In several instances, Far West adopters have replaced faltering alternatives with EBCE and have been clear on the point that EBCE was appealing because it enabled the districts to continue their commitment to non-traditional programs. Unlike what had been tried, however, staff in these districts observed that EBCE is an alternative program with structure. It has an identity and purpose which make it easy to describe and, if necessary, defend within communities which, either recalling flower children or facing rising taxes, are hostile to new and unfamiliar educational ventures.

In districts where it has been adopted, then, whether centralized or de-centralized, Far West's version has considerable support from those in control, perhaps as much because it is an attractive and clearly defined alternative in a system which favors alternative programs as because of its particular characteristics and components. Because of strong administrative support, Far West programs seem to be protected from some local problems which have affected other versions, such as EBCE staff recruitment from reserve teacher lists and the requirement that student-staff ratios be comparable to other programs within the district. Far West's version, with its emphasis on local staff parti-

cipation in final development, its goal of substantially changed student and teacher roles, and its image as an alternative program may make it somewhat less appealing than other models. But these characteristics are its strength as well, because adopting districts seem prepared to make the commitment the model requires, thus increasing the chances for success. Far West's view of implementation, then, is reflected in the model it has developed: the model is neither developed to the last detail nor easy to implement, and the local refinement and adaptation it requires is assisted by heavy doses of technical assistance and support from the lab.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory: Northwest's view of implementation stresses the importance of complete and detailed materials development to complement the staff training component which the lab has developed. The lab provides technical assistance to districts as required, but probably because so much of Northwest's potential constituency is spread through a geographical area which is far-flung and expensive to travel, the lab's main emphasis is on providing districts with materials which can be used without considerable assistance over time. The lab's training component consists of two weeks: one for district organizers responsible for introducing EBCE and building support and approval for it, and the other for local project staff who are trained once the district has decided to proceed. The training for both is much the same: it consists of walking individuals through the various tasks required -- for the organizer, tasks associated with building local commitment and making the program operational, and for staff, tasks designed to thoroughly familiarize them with EBCE's pedagogical and administrative procedures. This training consists primarily of simulations intended to help local staff literally

plan what's needed to get an EBCE project running. They are exercises intended to communicate the values of the model, build people's confidence that they can actually do what needs to be done, familiarize them with what these things are, and give them an opportunity to ask fairly detailed questions about how to do it.

Northwest feels that this training module is both useful and important, but it doesn't feel that, in theory, much training is essential. What is essential is familiarity with the model's main characteristics and compatibility with its values. Thus, the model's processes and procedures, while a useful guide, can be largely re-designed or in some cases set aside without necessarily perverting the lab's original concept of EBCE.

This helps to explain why Northwest's approach to implementation is largely through materials development and dissemination: the model has not been designed such as to require the performance of many carefully detailed activities which require the assistance of lab staff. Rather it revolves around a loose concept of how teachers and students should interact, the use of individualized student programs which include learning site experiences for between 30-50% of the students' time, the integration of work experiences and school-based learning, and an emphasis on career development with employers taking an active role as teachers and career models. The lab materials provide a careful guide for how to design and implement these essential components, but what's more important than following lab procedures is putting these components in place in a manner which is compatible with local needs and preferences. The lab thus believes that once local staff are familiar with these essential characteristics --

and they are carefully spelled out in Northwest's materials -- there will be minimal requirements for technical assistance, except, perhaps, for support and encouragement.

In the lab's view, some districts may be able to implement Northwest's EBCE with little if any formal lab training. Thus, the lab's materials can stand alone as a guide to implementation and, the lab feels, may facilitate adoption by districts unable to purchase expensive lab training. Northwest's view of implementation, then, stresses close familiarity with its carefully prepared materials, minimizes the importance of providing technical assistance services, and encourages local districts to adapt the model and its procedures according to local need. If anything, adaptation is the name of the game.

Research for Better Schools: RBS's view of implementation reflects their preference that EBCE be embedded in an on-going school rather than established as a separate and distinct alternative school program. This view no doubt stems from Philadelphia's history with alternative schools that failed to be incorporated and thus failed to survive, and RBS has developed a model which it hopes will turn out differently.

The central strategy for EBCE implementation is consistent with the model it has developed: this version of EBCE is an alternative program to be incorporated within a regular school, and careful attention is paid to the social system of schools such that the innovation will be accepted rather than rejected or cast adrift. In the lab's view, this is not to suggest that the school system will not be expected to change in order to accomodate EBCE. Indeed, RBS feels that many procedures and traditional school attitudes must be changed, and that by introducing the

innovation gradually, and in a way that doesn't stir up a storm of opposition, EBCE can serve as a useful change-agent in schools. RBS feels that the best way to do this is to take a low profile and work hard to build a constituency for EBCE among teachers as well as parents and employers. Thus, RBS's materials and training modules are supplemented with considerable technical assistance to local adopters -- assistance which is as much designed to build staff commitment to the innovation as provide them with substantive help with complex and unfamiliar parts of the model.

RBS's strategy is more an organization behavior approach to intervention and change than what the other labs have developed, for it relies heavily on one-to-one contact with project staff, and the process is best described as a counselling approach. Lab staff are careful to avoid heavy-handedness, and if anything, are eager to dispel the commonly held expectation among teachers that lab staff are there to lay another innovation on the schools. Since RBS feels that social system resistance is the biggest threat to EBCE, their approach is gradual and reflects the view that building commitment takes time. Thus, there are only four conditions set out as essential for EBCE start-up: staff release time for training and preparation, a coordinator to develop the work experience component of the model, guidance activities with students using lab materials, and a small group of staff and students to get the program underway. As the program takes root in the system, the lab expects that the model will be more fully implemented and that materials and components not perceived by staff as useful at the start will gradually assume greater importance.

RBS's view of implementation, then, is based heavily on the notion that social system acceptance of the innovation is critical, and that a gradualist approach backed up by considerable technical assistance and support

is the best way to build the commitment that successful implementation requires.

The four labs' views of implementation are in many ways similar, but each lab has developed a strategy which it thinks will increase the likelihood that the innovation will be adopted and well implemented for persistence in local school districts. All four labs agree that local adaptation is both desirable and bound to occur, while differing in how much adaptation is desirable, how adaptation should occur -- either with lab guidance or spontaneously according to local needs and constraints -- and how to determine the difference between constructive and useful adaptations, and perversions of the EBCE concept and its intent.

All labs also agree on the importance of training, materials and technical assistance. But again, the labs weigh the importance of these differently, and the models have been developed to reflect these differences. AEL emphasizes the importance of training and materials, but because the model is complex in its detail, the need for technical assistance is anticipated to help schools resolve implementation difficulties after initial staff training. Designed for broad appeal, AEL's model has given the lab a marketing orientation, and considerable attention is devoted to helping districts develop the employer sites necessary for placing students in the field right away. RBS stresses the importance of on-going technical assistance to adopters because the lab believes that support and encouragement are essential to overcoming school system resistance and building the commitment that successful implementation requires. This explains RBS's gradualist view of implementation as well and accounts for its view that students spend not

more than one day a week out of school. By not intervening dramatically in school systems at the start, this version of EBCE is expected to eventually produce the school system change to which EBCE aspires.

Northwest's main approach to implementation is by way of carefully prepared and elaborately detailed materials and procedures. Though the lab considers training and technical assistance important, it believes that the essence of EBCE is contained in five core components which sites can develop on their own, as well as in compatible values and attitudes about learning which are best insured by careful staff selection. Northwest, then, has a decidedly non-consultative approach to implementation, based on the view that well-developed materials accompanied by task-oriented training is the most that is generally needed to put this model in place.

Far West's view of implementation underscores the importance of identifying potential adopters willing to make the substantial necessary commitment in time and resources which its version of EBCE requires. Because Far West believes that staff participation in full model development is essential to both building commitment and learning through that participation why it is important for students to develop their own learning agenda, the model requires considerable training and technical assistance. Students and staff are thus asked to assume considerable personal responsibility and to undertake the difficult task of redefining their roles vis à vis one another. Far West's approach, then, stresses careful site selection and considerable training and attention during start-up as the best way to ensure successful implementation.

It is important to note here that these accounts of how the labs view implementation are not as discreet and different as this report per-

haps suggests. We have tried to highlight the main thrust of their views on the matter, but in the process fear that the result has made them seem vastly different. It is perhaps better to think of their approaches to implementation as a matter of emphasis rather than omission, for that is indeed more accurately the case. The differences between the labs are not unimportant, however, because in addition to providing the nation's 16,200 school districts with four models from which to choose, they have also presented districts with four approaches to implementation, some of which are stylistically and substantively compatible with the needs and preferences of some districts, and others which are not. In effect, then, this broadens the field of potential adopters of EBCE; districts are not only given an opportunity to respond to different models, but to different implementation strategies as well.

The Sites

If the labs share a common set of categories for considering implementations -- fidelity and adaptation -- but define the categories differently, the local districts do as well. Not surprisingly, the districts tend to define the categories in ways that are similar to those of the labs whose models they have chosen. Where labs' notions of implementation are such that they have been coded and proceduralized in lab materials and fidelity is considered in reference to the blueprint, local adopters view the materials as a roadmap and make efforts to use them that way. Adopters' views square with the labs', and the materials are used as the chief reference guide. But where the labs view fidelity more in terms of appropriate values and behavior rather than the presence of specific model components or procedures, sites seem also to be in accord: they are more concerned with

replicating the spirit and intent of the innovation, rather than its formal substantive framework.

Understanding these different notions of fidelity is central to understanding how the sites go about implementing EBCE. The presence or absence of model components and the use of lab materials tells part of the story of what's going on but by no means does it tell the whole story. The essence of EBCE is captured in lab materials in some instances, and local adopters who prefer those versions of EBCE do so at least in part because they favor guided implementation. In other instances, local adopters and the labs both view implementation in terms of the values, spirit and intent of EBCE.

In our view, the shared perspective of labs and local adopters is not coincidental, nor is it simply a matter of local absorption of lab views on the subject. Both share a common vocabulary which codes events in terms that have meaning for both, and it is possible to think of this as a product of lab training -- that adopters have assimilated the labs' notions of implementation because of extended contact and training in the models. But we believe that the similarities in their views accurately reflect more fundamental similarities across several dimensions. Both, we believe, share common values and attitudes about youth and schools, share similar backgrounds and professional experiences, share similar aspirations for structural and procedural change in the process of schooling, and hold a common belief in how much change is possible and how best to promote it. Furthermore, the labs and sites seem drawn to one another through shared interpersonal styles and stylistic preferences. The joining-up of labs and sites, then, is not quixotic or by chance, nor is it solely the result of

vigorous marketing. Lab and site relationships are the result of common attitudes, philosophies, and perspectives about schooling and change. These seem to have as much to do with why local adopters choose particular models of the innovation as anything specific to the different incarnations of EBCE.

The labs and their adopting sites, then, are compatible in a variety of ways, not least of which are their views on appropriate ways to implement EBCE. Both are concerned with model fidelity and with issues of adaptation and mutual adaptation. Both are concerned with implementing the innovation for persistence. But there are differences in how much they attend to the formal models of EBCE. On one hand, the labs are inevitably torn between the desire to see their full models implemented -- models in which they have invested considerable energy and attention over the past four years. All have developed interpretations of EBCE and would like to see how well these work in the field. They know that local adaptations must, and will, occur, but they know that local variations will not necessarily be improvements on the model. Some variations may lead to perversions of EBCE. The labs' wish for persistence of the innovation, then, struggles with the question of what it is that persists. Local adopters, on the other hand, are concerned with what form of the innovation persists, but they are also concerned that the innovation respond to local needs. In their view, a fair match between local needs and the form and structure of the innovation is critical if EBCE is to persist. Thus, the formal model is less central to local efforts, and implementation is viewed primarily in terms of local needs.

Local needs, however, mean different things to different local people. Another persistent theme which emerged from our work this summer,

then, is that local needs are understood and prioritized differently, depending on whom one talks to. Some view local needs in terms of state or local mandates to develop career education programs. Some identify them as student needs identified by the community to which the schools are expected to respond. Others view local needs in terms of an intervention in what they consider a pathological social system in schools. Their hope is to change the structure, to alter existing patterns and arrangements and make school more responsive to youth's needs for responsibility and choice.

Others think in pedagogical terms and think the chief local need is to develop programs which more closely link school to the real world. Still others think the central problem, and thus the top local need, concerns the stultifying professionalism of schools. They hope to provide opportunities for teachers to assume new roles, to come in closer personal contact with students, and to exercise more freedom and creativity than schools are thought to permit. And another group thinks the important local need is to develop programs which are responsive to youth -- programs which please them, rekindle their interest in learning, and encourage them to remain in school to graduate, if not go on to further training. Local needs, then, cover a wide range of issues.

These local needs were in evidence in one form or another, and in varying degrees, at each of the sites we visited. They were not perceived by school personnel to be in conflict with one another, but individuals' views on how well implementation was proceeding tended to reflect their ideas of which local needs were most important. We also observed during the course of our visits that while most people

hoped that EBCE would respond to several needs, there were one or two that stood out as central to their hopes for the innovation. In addition, we observed that there were categories of local needs which seemed most relevant to people, depending on their role or position in the school system. Thus, people tended to assess needs and size up the success of implementation in terms of their relevant frames of reference, and we turn to discussion of these now.

Administrators: Top level administrators -- superintendents and assistant superintendents -- view local needs within a larger political framework. In some cases, state or local boards mandated the development of career education programs, and top administrators were under order to comply. In other instances, community groups or school overseers thought work and school programs would meet the needs of a disaffected segment of the school population. In the case of Fresno, a court order to desegregate was imminent, and a magnet program of some sort was thought useful to avoid the confrontation. In each of these instances, EBCE was adopted for reasons external to the schools themselves and in response to an externally identified need. The specific choice of programs was somewhat off the point -- and it's here that the structure and identity of EBCE and its compatibility with local philosophy and values are important -- but a new program was determined as the best way to respond to the central need at hand.

Adoption of the innovation, then, is one criteria administrators use for judging the success of implementation. To the degree that mandates are met, local groups feel heard and issues such as court intervention are avoided, needs external to the schools themselves are met, and implementation is considered successful. In our conversations with top administrators

under pressures of this sort, they felt that implementation was by and large successful. Adoption seemed to be the central measure: in discussion with administrators hopeful that EBCE would improve the image of the school, generate good publicity, or, in the case of one private school, help to recruit new students, EBCE implementation was considered successful when these goals were met.

Principals: School principals are not insensitive to political purposes the innovation might serve, but their views of implementation are more specific to school organization and culture. During the course of our summer work, we found that principals and school administrators tend to think of implementation with respect to the overall curricular goals and organizational structure of the school. They view implementation in terms of how well the new program fits into on-going programs, how well it adheres to the main traditions of the school, and how readily it adjusts to the central administrative structure. This is not to say that school administrators undervalue EBCE's goals and the impact it is expected to have on students; on the contrary, some principals are more concerned with these specific goals. But as the chief school officer, most principals are concerned that EBCE be compatible with other dimensions of the school program and that it not disrupt prevailing arrangements. Where these conditions are considered important in judging implementation, EBCE has a less sunny record, and people feel there is more work to be done.

It was clear from our conversations that those who view implementation as a process of peacefully molding the innovation to fit the system do not expect it to happen overnight. They explain that it takes time for innovations to find their proper place in the system. Their views do not express a lack of tolerance. But it is clear that at this early stage of

implementation -- for most sites, not more than one semester or a year into operations -- they hold a qualified view of how well implementation is proceeding. There is hope that it will improve with time and a little seasoning. But at present, things are unsettled. With respect to many school administrators, then, implementation is considered in reference to prevailing practices and procedures. It is viewed as a process of adapting, adjusting and refining the innovation to fit smoothly into the organizational structure and culture of the school.

EBCE Staff: This group has several views on implementation and these seem to be a function of their staff roles and the ways in which they were recruited. More than top level administrators and school principals, EBCE staff view implementation in terms of their specific tasks and functions, the degree to which the innovation requires them to learn new roles, and the degree to which it satisfies their personal and professional needs as teachers.

With respect to role changes, the amount encouraged by EBCE is not consistent across models, so where proposed role changes are modest, teachers are noncommital on this point. Where models propose that teachers assume markedly different roles vis à vis their students and learn broad patterns of new behavior, however, the issue was much more on their minds. This was particularly true of EBCE staff with no strong allegiance to the innovation -- teachers who had been recruited from reserve lists, or teachers who preferred EBCE to current positions and were permitted to transfer. These teachers experienced more difficulty in their new roles and tended to spend more time on familiar parts of it -- or to reinterpret the new to make it more like the familiar. Staff

recruited this way were also more inclined to eliminate unfamiliar or uncomfortable role dimensions than their handpicked counterparts, and they complained more about how pressed and uneasy they felt. In their views, implementation was not proceeding as well as it might, and while they didn't fault the innovation, they often seemed uncertain about what was expected of them.

EBCE staff who had been carefully selected for their personal compatibility with the innovation's values and attitudes and their enthusiasm for the purposes of EBCE were considerably more sanguine about implementation efforts to date. While they too experienced some problems with new dimensions of their roles, they seemed to take it in stride and seemed more aware of what the specific problems were. They expected their performance would improve with time. If anything, these teachers probably overestimated the degree of implementation, for they were exceedingly eager to see the innovation succeed.

Other reasons why carefully selected staff held this view of implementation no doubt reflected the personal satisfaction they derived from their work. Either learning coordinators themselves, or program directors speaking for them, mentioned the gratification derived from working more closely with students on a one-to-one basis. Regular teaching duties often leave little time for extended personal contact and the luxury of learning more about the hopes and aspirations of individual students. EBCE provides opportunities for contact of just this sort, and EBCE staff eager to develop relationships with students, are encouraged to, and do. Teachers who chafe under the constraints of traditional school practices, too, seem pleased with the creative opportunities which EBCE provides. They are eager to see

the opportunities continue and expand, and this is reflected in their generally positive view on implementation efforts so far. Whether EBCE staff prefer increased contact with students, thrive on the possibilities for contact with employer and non-school personnel, or find increased flexibility in the EBCE program and format, teachers who made personal efforts to join the local program feel that implementation is more successful than staff who viewed the project as the most attractive job alternative available to them.

Local people's notions about implementation, then, are in many ways different from lab views on the subject. While the lab staff use their models as the chief anchor, local people use their personal and professional needs, political demands and requirements, local constraints, personal likings or dislikings, and compatibilities or incompatibilities with EBCE as the central criteria by which they arrive at some conclusion about how well implementation is proceeding. This, of course, serves to reveal a mixed picture to those to ask around the district. In our view, this is not a problem to overcome, but evidence for our notions that implementation cannot be understood in relation to any one frame of reference. Each is as plausible as the other because each depends on what one thinks is important. This, of course, is subjective.

As a result, we do not expect that the mixed picture of implementation will substantially clear up with time. Indeed, it may become more confused, as people now indifferent or uncertain about EBCE take a position. For future research efforts, then, the issue is not one of attempting to resolve different local views of what's happening, but rather to understand what the views are and why people see things as they do, and to present a composite picture.

VIII. Sketches of Ten EBCE Sites

The tracing of patterns and themes across the fabric of implementation is useful and, in this case, was a chief purpose of our study. But useful

as such mapping may be, much of the texture and detail of field activities is lost in reports concerned only with macro-analysis and interpretation. In a modest effort to come to grips with this problem, we are here including brief sketches of ten pilot sites which we visited.

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS

Washington Township, New Jersey (Sewell)

The program in this suburban town of about 20,000 located thirteen miles southeast of Philadelphia is being "infused" into the high school curriculum rather than set up as a separate program. The district had proclaimed career education goals and established a Careers House for one third of the 1750 students in its only high school, and EBCE was adopted as a means of providing some structure for this local innovation. The vice principal in charge of the House and the program coordinator, the only full-time EBCE staff person, told us that new courses in Careers English and Careers History were developed last year, and were taught by several Careers House teachers.

Although the program in Washington Township did not begin operations until March, 1976, 92 tenth through twelfth grade students were enrolled in these new courses last year. They spent one half day per week exploring careers in one of the twenty-five employer sites recruited in the area, and also had guidance activities one period a week. Future plans for this program, which is supported partly by state funds, call for extended "specializations" with employers for students who complete one year of explorations.

Washington, Pennsylvania

EBCE came to this old industrial town 35 miles southwest of Pitts-

burgh as an outgrowth of an earlier urban-suburban cooperative project in which a group of teachers from three school districts had developed a career education program. When their Title III-funding ran out, two of these districts adopted EBCE, which began in January of 1976 in both the Catholic and public high schools. The two programs had one full-time coordinator last year, and shared the use of the ten employer resource sites which were recruited.

The program, which was supported solely by local funding, served forty-two high school students in 1976-77. They spent the better part of one day weekly doing site explorations and had regular guidance sessions with a school counsellor trained in use of RBS materials. The EBCE students took regular school courses to satisfy their academic requirements, and some staff resistance to the program was reported as teachers complained about EBCE students missing their classes. The program will be without its coordinator during school year 1976-77, as a shrinking budget in Washington forced staff lay-offs.

APPALACHIA EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY

North Syracuse Schools, New York

EBCE was set up in this suburban district of 13,000 students to serve senior high students in the two system high schools. The learning center is housed at a third location, in the building of the state's regional BOCES offices (Bureau of Cooperative Educational Services). Students spent one day per week at this center, working with the learning coordinator, and spent the other four days in one of about twenty employer sites. Aside from the learning center space, program support is 100% local.

This was the smallest program visited during the summer study. We

were told that six twelfth grade students completed the semester, although ten were initially involved when the program began in January of 1976. The only EBCE staff person here was a retired teacher who worked two days per week as learning coordinator.

Kanawha County Schools, West Virginia

Kanawha County, which includes the city of Charleston, has one of the larger EBCE pilot implementations. The program operated in four district high schools during 1976-77, serving approximately 80 students in grades 11 and 12. EBCE has been a part of the system for over two years, starting in one high school in early 1974. Currently, the four projects are coordinated by the district's Director of Career Education, a central office administrator.

The students in these programs, which are 100% locally-supported, benefit from their proximity to the Appalachia Laboratory, as Kanawha EBCE utilizes upwards of 200 employer resource sites which were developed by AEL staff for its demonstration school. Students spend up to 80% of their time each week working in these sites, and the rest in their home schools under the direction of one of five full-time learning coordinators.

St. Francis School, Staten Island, New York

EBCE operates here as an alternative program within an alternative school. The administrator of this small, private, nondenominational high school was looking for a vehicle for providing students with community experiences when he came into contact with EBCE. He and several other staff began site recruitment and development activities in the fall of 1975, and the program got underway with ten students (out of a total enrollment of only 82) in January, 1976.

During the spring term, these eleventh and twelfth graders spent more than 50% of their time on location in the 30-employer sites on the island. When they were in school for their academic work, the students were assisted by two teachers who spent about 1 1/2 days per week with EBCE duties -- there were no full-time program staff at St. Francis.

NORTH WEST REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY

Kennewick, Washington

EBCE in this south-central Washington city takes the form of an alternative program housed in a downtown professional building. The program was initiated by the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, and so far has been funded solely from the local basic education budget under his control. He also selected the three full-time professional staff who ran the program during 1975-76, recruiting two of them from outside the school district, one from as far away as Seattle.

The program began in fall of 1975, and during its first year served 31 students from both district high schools. The students spent about half of their time in the learning center, and the other half exploring some of 68 work locations. These sites are scattered throughout the Tri-Cities of Kennewick, Pasco, and Richland and the surrounding Columbia River basin, and draw heavily on the area's two major industries of agriculture and atomic energy.

Colville, Washington

In this rural town of only about 5,000 in the northeast Washington mountains, EBCE is run as basically a one-man operation. The director, learning manager, and site coordinator is also the district Work

Experience director. So these two programs share the same small space, a converted storeroom in the town's only junior high school building.

The program served 20 senior high students last year, its first year of operations. They were reported to have spent between 50% and 60% of their time in the learning center (across campus from the high school), and the rest in their employer experience sites. Despite the size and relative isolation of the town, 64 sites were recruited to work with the program, offering a total of over 200 different careers for exploration. The greatest number of these careers -- about 100 distinct occupations -- were available through the National Forest Service, a major employer in this lumbering and agricultural region.

Hillsboro, Oregon

Career education came to this suburban Portland town as a program for low-achieving and pre-dropout students. In 1975-76, Project TOTAL served 60 such troubled students referred from the two local high schools. They attended classes in a learning center on the campus of one high school, and reportedly spent 50% of their time exploring careers in the 100 or so community resource sites which have formed links with the program.

EBCE in Hillsboro had three full-time professionals and two part-time support staff last year. The program, which was sponsored by the district's Coordinator of Career Education (formerly a member of the North West Lab staff), opened its doors to students in October, 1975. In the early months, this program received some state support in the form of funding for the "vocationally disadvantaged," but has since become 100% locally financed.

FAR WEST LABORATORY

Fresno, California

Fresno adopted EBCE in mid-1975 in an attempt to racially balance a Black ghetto school. Under pressure from HEW, the superintendent initiated the program as the core for a district-wide magnet at Edison High School. EBCE was established as a department within the regular school structure, but had some extra financial support. There were five EBCE staff members, three of whom worked about 3/4 time with the program and also taught other courses in the school.

In school year 1975-76, approximately 75 senior high students took part in EBCE activities. About 60% of the students transferred to Edison from the two other Fresno high schools (which were predominantly White); the remainder were already Edison students. EBCE students explored career opportunities in a variety of settings, had counselling and instruction in the learning center, and satisfied basic skills requirements by taking some regular courses in the rest of the school.

Salt Lake City, Utah

EBCE was brought here to serve as an alternative program for Highland High School, which had a dropout problem despite drawing its enrollment from the city's affluent professional neighborhoods. The program began operations with 27 students in October, 1975, and then expanded to its maximum of 54 for the spring term. These eleventh and twelfth graders spent about three days each week in career explorations in the 65 employer resource sites developed by the program staff. The other days were spent in the learning center, a cluster of classrooms situated off by itself at the end of a wing at Highland.

Financial support here seems solid, since a full 50% comes from the state's "Career Development and Dropout Prevention" funds, and the district superintendent is on record as strongly supporting career education. There were four full-time staff during 1975-76, and they were paid to do two months of training and program development last fall before students came on board. Far West Lab people thought staff quality and preparation was the chief reason Salt Lake City is considered to be a high fidelity site.